1956 (July 3-5): cover letter and transcript of part of Council of State Chiropractic Examining Boards (COSCEB, forerunner of today's FCLB) meeting, 23rd Annual Congress, includes talks by O.D. Adams, Ed.D. and John J. **Nugent**, D.C. (Cleveland/KC Archives; in my COSCEB/FCLB file):

COUNCIL OF STATE CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINING BOARDS
Twenty-Third Annual Congress
July 3, 4, 5, 1956

TO: All Member Boards

Attached hereto are talks by Dr. O.D. Adams, Educational Director of the I.C.A., and Dr. J.J. Nugent, Educational Director of the N.C.A., given at our Annual Convention in Chicago on July 4, 1956. Study these talks.

The aim of this Council is to have the Chiropractic profession accepted by the U.S. Commission on Education. These two talks will discuss what must be accomplished before acceptance is assured. For instance:

1. That so long as there is divergence of standards of N.C.A. and the I.C.A., the Commission will never accept our profession.
2. That without the acceptance of the U.S. Commission on Education of the Chiropractic system of accrediting, neither the I.C.A. nor the N.C.A. can enjoy its full measure of success.
3. That a common meeting ground must be found and one set of standards on accrediting and on education be formulated in order for the Chiropractic profession to have solidarity and be accepted by the U.S. Commission.

This Council is not trying to unite the two national organizations; it does not intend to appease anyone; but it is endeavoring to get the two educational systems on accreditation together for the betterment of the organizations themselves; for the members of our profession; and for the students who are to become the Chiropractors of the future.

Question. Could and should a joint meeting of the N.C.A. and I.C.A. be held in Louisville, Kentucky January 17-19, 1957? This is the date for a meeting of the Public Relations meeting in Louisville.

Your constructive ideas on the above subjects are earnestly requested. Write your secretary. This is your Council, your business, and your sovereign right as a state. We need the support of every member Board and every member in each Board in order to accomplish our aim.

-attached transcipt of talks by O.D. Adams, Ed.D. and John J. Nugent, D.C.:

Twenty-Third Annual Congress Chicago, Illinois
Wednesday, July 4, 1956 Dr. Peters presiding

Dr. O.D. Adams

The first speaker on our agenda this afternoon is a gentleman who has a wide experience in his field. He has served as Public School Superintendent of the Seattle, Washington school system; he has also served on the State School System of the State of Oregon; he has served with the Navy for seven years as an educational representative. He has worked with the San Francisco Public School System; and at this time he is President of the Research and Education Corporation of San Francisco, California. It gives me great pleasure to present to you **Dr.**

O.D. Adams, who holds a doctorate degree in Education, to speak to you at this time. Dr. Adams.

Dr. Adams: "I might be considered some sort of an authority in Revolutionary History and I have made a particular study because of some family roots which I have in the Loyalist Movement of Americans who at one time refused to fight against the King and went up into New Brunswick, on my mother's side. And in looking over the history of that Movement I got interested in some church history; the church's name I am not going to mention because there may be some members of that church congregation here. But I can remember the ministers used to be considerably worried about the camp meetings because there was some skullduggery that took place at some of the camp meetings and one of them was that they paid the preachers in rum, so that they always had an excess of rum around the camp meetings. I feel a good deal like the preacher who brings the rum to the camp meeting – afraid the devil is probably there also.

I am not sure today exactly of my position here except that I know this – that to begin with, I am not mad at anybody. Secondly, I am only a person who has had a life-time of training in the field in which I profess to be somewhat of an experienced person. And in being an experience person I know that I make mistakes and I know that the documents which I prepared are probably not at all comparable in value or in format to documents that might be prepared by other people in the same area.

In the preparation of this document which I am to talk to you about this afternoon, the die, the standard for accrediting process in the Chiropractic colleges is not prepared like I would prepare a document to evaluate the University of Maryland. It is not prepared in the way I would probably evaluate your Chiropractic schools ten years from now, but as a beginning document, as a means of getting a program under way, and as a means of realizing some of he objectives we have in mind in this accrediting procedure, this is the best document we could prepare in a realistic way to measure the schools that we want to measure with this instrument.

Dr. Baer wrote me sometime ago, sometime the middle of June, to prepare an answer to a questionnaire, a copy of which you have with you. But I want to use this questionnaire partly as a basis of my talk today because I will make some side comments and will bring out some other things I think we are both concerned about, which we both might discuss with interest.

I was approached by Dr. Robert Dunham (I don't know whether you know him or not) in San Francisco about the latter part of 1949 to prepare some kind of a plan and see what could be done to upgrade the schools of Chiropractic that he had called to my attention. I went on with that program then and made a study of those schools and have the results of that study which I am not going to talk about today, but we made an honest effort to determine what the condition of the schools were at that time and that was in 1950.

One of the first things I did was to go down to the U.S. Office of Education and discuss the matter with the people who have charge of the accrediting procedure in the Office of Education. I discovered at that time that there were two agencies engaged in the same procedure.

Now I want to talk with you a minute, off the record, about this U.S. Office of Education for accrediting schools. In the first place, I don't think the Office of Education is going to support any agency that has a division in its ranks as, shall I say, in Chiropractic. Now I am not a Chiropractor but I am very much interested in this movement. And I fell that as long as we have a division – a national division in our ranks – that the U.S. Office of Education is not going to support our accrediting procedure. Now that is my personal opinion. I have talked with them a number of times and I have come to the same conclusion each time. I feel that the

document, as far as the document is concerned, will hold water, but Dr. Golthorp in the Office of Education said to me, "Well, you don't mention in it specifically what the ratio should be between teachers and pupils." I said, "What do you think it ought to be?" "Well," he said, "I think t ought to be one to eight." Well, let me tell you people something. I have attended classes and you have attended classes of between 100 and 500 people in classes of established, well organized universities. I have attended classes at Stanford University with 500 enrolled in it. Some other classes at the University of California with 1,500; and Dr. Goldthorp says to me, "In your Chiropractic Colleges, your ratio ought to be 1 to 8"! I just don't believe that a school has to have a ratio of 1 to 8 to be a good school.

Now let me qualify that a little bit. There are some areas (and perhaps you wouldn't want more than 1 to 8); it might be in some kind of scientific classes where – like physics or chemistry – although you will find very few schools outside of private schools or private secondary schools where they might have that kind of an arrangement. But ordinarily speaking, I would say that the idea that Dr. Goldthorp was trying to get across to me was that he had no intention of adopting this system or any other system for the accrediting of your schools until the profession made one concerted attack on this problem.

Now, if you go down through Dr. Baer's questionnaire you will see that we have tried to develop from the beginning the policy of slow procedure in this accrediting procedure so that by the time we got our accrediting procedure and guide set up, it would meet pretty well, in a realistic manner, the provisions that we want to set up as a guide for standards in the I.C.A. schools. It provides for certain purposes and those purposes we have set forth in that way: that the formal statement of purpose of the college shall indicate that the institution is organized to do a number of things. Now you can find that in any good accrediting procedure and it is not new with us. Then we try to simplify it and bring it to the forefront a little bit so that we can be sure that we don't get statements and advertising in catalogues, material that are not in keeping with the purpose. We say this: that clear, simple language shall be used in catalogues and guidance material, supporting the formal statement of purpose of the college; third: that all facilities of the institution and contacts made by representatives will support the formal statement of purpose – that is, the school is organized to do this, and this, and this; and not this and that and something else. Fourth: the valuation of the institution by the Education Commission of Accreditation shall harmonize with the formal statement of purpose.

Now that is general. But it is specific, also. We try to put safeguards in there that this will be used as a guide for the development and upgrading of the schools. Then, we have a great deal to say about the competence of the faculty, about the organization. I have covered in here the student-faculty ratio and I have said in there the student-faculty ratio must be in keeping with good educational practice as found in the state colleges and universities in the state or locality of the Chiropractic colleges.

Let's take the State of Oregon with which I am more or less familiar. The state institutions – the University of Oregon and the Oregon State College – are, I would say, good standard organizations and their Chiropractic school in that state would meet the condition as far as the ratio of student and faculty are concerned. I would think it should be satisfactory for the Office of Education and certainly other Chiropractic colleges.

Now under "Curriculum" we have divided that into three areas: science, clinical and general, and you may or may not agree with it. This is the way we have set it up. That physical therapy if required should be in addition to and separate from the Chiropractic curriculum. I think that there is a body of information beg enough in the Chiropractic field so that we can put that statement in and support it and make it part of our full program in the

states where that seems to be necessary. Then we have a provision for student personnel services; we have other areas of student personnel service.

I think you will find that we are probably a little bit heavily weighted in this are of giving the student responsibility and it is for this purpose: in most institution, most collegiate institutions, now days there is a great drive for the development of social concept – democratic concept of people working and living together. So we have tried to weight this guide so that the activity of the student himself will produce some of the social contacts that he might not otherwise get. For instance, we believe in giving him considerable responsibilities in certain areas of school affairs which would give him some understanding of leadership, some understanding of how to handle himself on his feet, some understanding of how to get on with his fellow students and some idea of what it means to belong to a student organization so that when he steps out of the school, he already has a background in the area of social relationship.

One other area that I want to call to your attention is the area of administration in which there seems to be some criticism. That has to do with the general control of the college itself. Some form of control shall be established and it is suggested that the school educational division be represented on this board. The length of term of the Board members may be established in accordance with local policy. The tenure of the Board members should be over-lapping for continuity and for coordination. The officers of the administration shall be appointed by the Board of Control and the functions of the Board of Control are to establish policy rather than to administer it. Now I say that because I feel that is proper in a country where we believe in some kind of democratic control, but I don't feel that the national policy of standards should take away from the school the right to appoint such members as they see fit on that board. I think they should have something to say about the type of general control which is established by their own school and college.

Now while I am on this part of it – the administration – I would like to talk a moment about the non-profit idea which we have not taken into consideration in the accrediting of our schools for the simple reason that I don't feel that the fact that a school is a non-profit one necessarily makes it a good school. And I don't' feel that if a school is a profitable school, a school that makes a profit, is necessarily a bad school. I think it has nothing whatsoever to do with the educational procedures which we are trying to set up – whether a school is profit or non-profit. I think that is entirely beside the point. I think that everyone of you knows something about some small corporation some place, that a fellow has tried to set up because he has tried to preserve his fund for some other purpose. So he sets up a non-profit organization and the profit goes into everything except perhaps where it should be going. And I don't feel that because you have a non-profit school that you necessarily take the excess money and put it into the school for the purpose of upgrading. I am not, when I say that, I don't mean to belittle anyone's motives, but I don't feel that the non-profit idea per se means one iota when it comes to measuring the educational standards of that school.

Now with this idea in mind, then, of upgrading these schools and utilizing the guide as a beginning procedure – we don't hope to stop here; we hope to improve this guide every year and finally bring it up so that it is a real accrediting instrument. But to do that we don't hold to change the complexion of the school the first year. We have made an effort to do something of an action type that will upgrade these schools and make them better and finally bring them in the periphery of where they ought to be to make them good preparatory schools for your profession.

Now let me talk a little bi about that idea. We started out with these workshops to see what could be done and, in the process, I have visited every school that I know sometime or other in the U.S. I have made courtesy calls to some schools – the Chiropractic Institute of New York

– and I have a pretty good respect for all Chiropractic schools in the country with the exception of two or three which I would not recommend for approval. How many of you have ever started a business of your own? I think you all have – every doctor here has sweated it out that first year or so, haven't you? Well, if you haven't, you haven't been any place. If you haven't sweated out and tried to get a little business established, you don't know what sweat and tears and blood have gone into that thing to get it going, get it on its feet, and get it well established, and get it to be a paying organization.

Now, when I go into some of these places – I try to compare these schools as I would compare the Chiropractic Institute of New York or the National School up in Chicago, or the Palmer down in Davenport, or the Logan Basic College in St. Louis. But some of the other schools I can't make a comparison of the facilities; there is no way you can compare the facilities. If I should take the Chiropractic Institute of New York and try to compare it with the University of Washington, why there wouldn't be too much comparison that you could make. It would be very unfair; it wouldn't be the right kind of comparison to make. But when you look in the State of New York and you see three schools operating there and you look at the necessity for Chiropractic doctors all over this country and you find out that the enrollment is fairly good in all three schools, excellent in some, you wonder if the process of elimination is the process that should take place. Should they provide you with the people who do the Chiropractic work? Maybe it is not in the process of elimination as much as it is the process of consolidation. You already have students enrolled in all three schools, and if you start to eliminate your students, then you have got to provide some way of getting them back if you come anywhere near meeting the needs of your profession. So I would – it looks to me at least – that the sensible and realistic thing to do is to take these schools and build them up, and through the process of democratic workshops to gradually consolidate them and bring them together so that you have a well established training system for all doctors.

We have tried, then, through this process of workshops to promote the schools and upgrade them, and gradually improve this instrument so that it becomes a good accrediting procedure; and do the two things simultaneously until we arrive at a well established program of upgrading and a well established program of Chiropractic schools.

Now there are a great many problems involved in this thing. The text book problem is big enough problem for a commission to be established to do nothing else but to improve your text books and your methods of presentation. I feel that there is a great opportunity for improvement in that area.

I feel that the technical area – in presenting the technical part of how to make the adjustments, or how to handle the X-ray, or whatever your other technical problems are – that you need help in that area and we are trying to give it to you.

Now I would like to take a moment to illustrate one or two of these methods which we are trying to use. I use one which I call the "brain storming" method which was devised recently by a member of a very great advising concern in this country – Barton, Barton, Osborne and somebody else. Osborne was the man who created this brain storming method and we used it some this summer – last summer, rather – to get some idea of how we could improve the Chiropractic profession. I have got about 5 or 6 pages of material on it. It came out of these brain storming symposiums which we carried on. That is just one method. But we have other methods which I use for training of people in skills and how to put over the technical subjects. And I am going to take a moment to impose on Dr. Peters to ask him to give me a little help on this because I think right here is the place for it.

Now, do you have any children? I want to say that this is an illustration of one method which we teach in the workshop as a means of giving interest in skill subjects. You have one

child? Have you ever felt the need of a paper cup when you have been out with the youngster some place – on a picnic, or when they need a drink? Now, I have a sure fire method for making a paper cup. Would you like to make it? Would you like to learn how to do that? Well, you take a piece of this fine, beautiful Morrison Hotel paper here and you fold it like that, as a means of squaring it up. And you tear this. So that your first move in this thing is to square your paper and then you fold it and take the left corner and fold it to about the center of the opposite side. You take the right corner and fold it in a similar manner so that the top and that part of it become similar. Then this flap, you fold in a crease and there – you have got a paper cup. Dr. Ohlson tells me that this will hold Bourbon, but not for long because it burns a hole in the bottom of it! Now do you think you could make one? You try and I will stand by and give you help… Your cup is better than mine. Thank you.

Now what is this thing for? Well, it is to illustrate to you that there is a way to do things, that things can be taught very simply, but that they have to be clearly defined and outlined. It looks like we did this in just a few minutes (which we did) but it took a long time for this to come about because behind this are the psychological principles involved which are taken care of and which we don't befog the issue by telling the history of the paper cup. Our business is to make the paper cup. Our business is to teach Chiropractic students to do adjustments. Our business is to teach people to do things in all this manner of teaching. Now, to handle a lecture you can use this outline, but this isn't the best outline for a lecture but it <u>is</u> the best outline for any kind of a "doing" job. So we teach the principles of doing this thing.

Now all of you that were in the Army, some of you in the Navy, you will remember that you used to sometimes do things by the counter. First, you square the paper; 2nd, you fold it 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Those are the steps in teaching process of teaching this lesson, and 95% of the teachers in Chiropractic schools do not know how to do this. And this s a very simple procedure. It is simple and we aim to keep it simple. So when you send your boy to school or the boys from your town to school, you want to send them to where they can learn to do the thing they need to do as well as to know the thing they need to know. So we teach the whole area and I am going to give you some copies of our workshop before you go, and in that we have this lesson set up and the whole idea is to get them a skill by which they can better teach their skill subjects.

Then we go into the other area – into utilizing other adult methods of procedure. We have panels. We have direction methods in all types including the conference procedure, and including this brain storming process which I told you about with the idea of mine of making our teachers capable teachers.

I have a very great respect for the teachers that I have contacted in these Chiropractic schools. I have a very great respect for them. I think in the main they are very capable; they are certainly interested and they certainly are motivated, much better than some teachers I have been with over other years. But the teachers are good people; they are very much interested; but they need help in such simple areas as how to put over their questions in many different kinds of ways and how to utilize the adult method and the procedures in bringing about the upgrading process of the schools.

Now just a little bit about visiting the schools. I traveled about 15,000 miles in visiting these schools. Some I made courtesy calls only. I didn't feel that I wanted to go into schools that I ,well let me say frankly, that didn't belong to the I.C.A., and I didn't want to make enemies of my friends in the N.C.A. either, so I made courtesy calls to a number of the schools and was treated very well. I have nothing but the highest respect for the members of your Chiropractic schools. I went to the National in Chicago; I went to the School in Minneapolis; I went to the School in Indianapolis; I went to the School in Dayton; I went to 3 schools in New

York; I didn't get to the Chiropractic Institute in New York until last February, but I got there. I went to the School in Toronto; to the School in Davenport, one in St. Louis; and I went to the Carver School down in Oklahoma. I went to the Texas School in San Antonio but I missed Dr. Griffin over at Ft. Worth, and I have been in three schools in Los Angeles. That is a total of 18 schools. Now the motive valuation of schools looks like this: You have got 7 schools tat are excellent; 8 that are fair and you have got 3 that are just hanging on by their toes. But I think that in the main in those 3 schools, in two of them at least if you could get a few more students, then your problem would begin to be improved. But one school I wouldn't recommend that it be continued at any cost. So the way it looks, you have 7 excellent, 8 fair, 2 hanging on by their toes and 1 that ought to be out of business and I think it probably is by now.

So if I might just take a moment to reiterate what I have said here today:

We don't feel that this accrediting instrument which you will get as a guide is a perfect instrument. WE think it is the best that we can get under the circumstances and that it is good enough to be considered an accrediting procedure. We feel that the upgrading program which we have undertaken in these schools is a thing that is going to bring the schools into full fruition and will bring about a better accrediting procedure for us and bring about a better trained applicant for you.

A question and answer period followed.

Dr. Baer: In your summation on education and formulating your criteria, did you take into consideration that the N.C.A. had a criteria prepared and was working with those schools possibly for about 15 years? These same groups of schools that you put on your list of accrediting have formerly, I understand, made application to the N.C.A. Committee on N.C.A. Standards and for one reason or other they couldn't come up to the standards that they felt that they should. Now these schools went into this thing before and we are now taking another commission and putting through the very same thing after about 10 years later. Are we going to help them this time or just continue the process that has been going on?

Dr. Adams: Well, I feel that unless you would set up some kind of procedure of upgrading and bringing these schools up to maximum standards that it would be no use in continuing the process because they were good fellows, or for some reason you want to recognize them.

Dr. Tawney: What do you think could be done to bring these two groups together?

Dr. Adams: That should be the $64,000 question.

Dr. Poulsen: I would like to have your definition for consolidation, Dr. Adams. You mean consolidation in eliminating the schools by consolidation and taking one good school out of – say a number of inferior ones – or spreading it out so that they all have the same teaching methods – or what is your definition?

Dr. Adams: I would like to talk about this question a bit. Let's take the situation in one of the schools in New York that I visited recently. I met the head of that school, I was in the school and was very much impressed with his earnestness, his sincerity, his approach of this problem; was impressed with his school, with his facilities and everything he is doing. And I would say that if you would make a comparison with two other schools in that locality – that if you should visit all three schools, you would come away impressed with what the first school I mentioned is doing, and perhaps not so much impressed by what the other two schools are doing.

However, you need to look into it a little bit further than that. I went down to one of the schools and at that time consequently refused to consider the at all for accreditation. Then, when I went down again in February and got those teachers together, I changed my mind because I ran into some of the most intelligent, some of the most able and capable teachers that I ran on to any place in my travels concerning this work. So I feel that the process of consolidation might gradually come about through the conducting of workshops where teachers could become better acquainted, where schools could become better acquainted and there is no reason – there is no reason that you shouldn't have some place in this country for a real graduate school for Chiropractors. And you can continue to have schools that can prepare them on certain elementary subjects and then your better schools can pt the heat on and you can give them some good graduate work which they need badly. Now my idea is not elimination, as I stated a moment ago, but through a process of that nature you might possibly bring about some consolidation in these schools.

This is not a problem that is going to [be] solved over night but I don't think you can solve it by elimination, for the minute you start in with your elimination process, you continue the old grudges, you continue the old personality fights; you continue whether it is a mixed school or a straight school; or what have you. Those wounds don't heal. But you <u>can</u> heal them by bringing about some kind of consolidation process rather than in elimination process. Now that is my own personal opinion. I haven't been able to prove it yet but I think it can be demonstrated.

Now your question – What can be done to bring these schools together? That is a pretty tough question and I probably couldn't answer it in the next 20 years and do it right. But could I talk to you just a moment of my ideas?

I have had a great deal of experience over the years; I have been president of a national association; a Vice President of a very large national association for 6 years; I have been very active in national affairs in my own profession. Now I look at a national association in many different ways. Let's take the necessity, the need, to understand the need for national Chiropractic groups. Now instead of one association you have two associations, and I am not sure that isn't a good thing. It may keep you on your toes, I don't know about that. But there is only one purpose of organizing a big national association and that is <u>solidarity</u>. But if you organize into a national association to protect your profession and to see it grow, aside from the political objectives, is the objective of your professionalism. That is, you want to make good Chiropractic doctors and you want them to be professional. Consequently, you band yourselves together in an association to bring about a professional feeling and to bring about professional improvement. All you have to do, we have had here for the last two or three days. I could say that many of them had to do with pure and simple professional improvement.

In other words, you were trying to motivate yourselves for better professional practice and when you come here, when Dr. Peters comes here, you get together and you get a lot of help from each other in a professional way. There is the young doctor comes here. He learns a little bit – but the thing that is important to him is, "How am I going to get patients so that I am going to make a living when I first go to work?" And that is a very, very important thing to him. That is not so important to gentlemen like you who have worked for many years and have already established your practice. So there are many areas when you come together to meet as a national association. But to get the punch, to get the umph, you establish yourself as a political organization. I don't mean that you are Democrats or Republicans. I mean you are Chiropractors and you organize yourselves to get strength so that the strength can be used to promote your professional cause.

Now that is a very important thing to understand in national organizational work. You have got people in the organization who are good Chiropractic politicians. That is, they are earnest; they get busy and do this and do that; they are the "action people." They get action for you. Then you have got the fellow who comes – he has an idea. His main purpose in coming here is to express his ego, to get his message over to you; to be able to expound his theory; to be able to show you that, in his opinion, his theory is correct; that his is the only correct theory. He needs a place to come to; he needs a public platform. He needs some place to come to express that ego and to give you material upon which a profession grows.

Now you have got two or three people that I know of that are of that kind. You have got a number of people who have theories, pet theories that hey need to express; they need a place to talk about it in; that is your professional group. But they should see that in their professionalism they can' cut off the political end because the political end is the end that makes the thing go. It is the end that brings in the money and you need money to operate your conventions, operate your national proceedings. Now to me, that is a long winded statement in trying to say to you that you need both things. You need the place for the person to express himself, to expound his theory – and he can do it in the professional section gatherings; and you need the place for the politician who wants o get it organized and get it going and keep it going. That is the best explanation I can make to your question. And if you don't have it, you don't have solidarity in your profession.

Dr. Griffin: As a point of information, Dr. Adams, relative to the recognition by the U.S. Office of Education, I think it is generally conceded that they (the Chiropractic profession) probably will not be recognized there until there is a unified bond of education. Is that correct?

Question asked: Well, relative to your qualifications, there is one item you brought up relative to profit and non-profit schools, **is it necessary for a school to be on a non-profit basis** to qualify for recognition here in the U.S. Office of Education?

Dr. Adams: Well, Mr. Goldthorpe raised the point, an issue, in that. And he says that, but I don't. I think that a concerted effort on the part of the professional and political organization of the Chiropractic Association will do a great deal to help. I think that Mr. Goldthorpe is hedging on it because I don't think he wants to make a decision. If the I.C.A. should go get the schools accredited in accordance with the accrediting procedure accepted, then there certainly would be a dog fight.

Let's talk in common terms so that we can understand it. I don't think that either one of the two associations would sit by idly if the U.S. Office of Education should recognize one and not the other. It is just as simple as that. And I don't think the Office of U.S. Education can afford to do it. If one organization should go and get the procedure adopted, then all the political boys back in the states where they didn't want to adopt or accept it would see that their Senators and Representatives would call on Mr. Goldthorpe and he, boy, would be in hot water. He isn't going to do it.

I worked in the office of Education for a while and wrote a bulletin on police training there. I think I know a little bit of how they operate. I don't think they can afford to do it, to be perfectly frank about it.

I don't know whether I have done much good here today. I have certainly made an attempt to be honest and frank about this thing and whether my ideas are good, well – that will have to be weighted by you. I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity and hope that they have done some good. I think there is a great future ahead for Chiropractic and certainly there is a great need for doctors and I don't know how else you are going to do it unless you do

something to encourage your schools and build them up, because you need doctors to fill the places of those who are dropping out for one reason or another.

Dr. Getchell: Do you thin the average Board member can make an intelligent survey of Chiropractic colleges?

Dr. Adams: I would say that any Board of Examiners who had more than a year of experience in examining applicants could make a pretty good survey of Chiropractic colleges. Now I don't feel that they could get into some of the professional high points, if you want to bring up this question about areas, but I do believe they could make an intelligent survey of what was going on.

Dr. John Nugent

Dr. Peters introduced the next speaker, **Dr. John Nugent, N.C.A. Director of Education.**

Dr. Nugent: Dr. Peters, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Adams, Gentlemen: This is a very, very heartening experience. As early as 1923 while I was yet a young graduate of a school of Chiropractic, I began to talk to Chiropractors in conventions wherever I could reach their ears, asking them to evince some interest in Chiropractic education. In those days about the only topic of conversation at lyceums or state conventions was, "How's business?" and "We ain't getting no publicity." This whole subject of education in those days was also something of very, very passing interest. And so I have watched over the years the slow evolution in the Chiropractic profession. I think that this occasion here is perhaps a peak of the interest in education. I certainly am happy to have lived to see this day and this occasion when so many earnest people come here for the one purpose of talking about upgrading Chiropractic education.

Now I feel that we are particularly fortunate in having Dr. Adams here. An outsider, a man who has lived with the problems of education (it is true they are not the problems of professional education, but education). And Dr. Adams' talk here today reminds me of the talks we used to make in the year 1934. Dr. Adams is repeating all that we used to say. In those days when we were trying to get the school men to listen to us – "Something must be done"; "Something ought to be done." "We ought to help these schools to reach an accredited basis." I see many old faces here who have been through the years. I also see many new faces and so if the older people will bear with me, I would like to recount for the benefit of the newer ones who are here something of the past history of this effort. I also feel that Dr. Adams would like to know this. I think he has been placed in a very embarrassing position, maybe, by reason of the fact that he has not been entirely acquainted with what we have done, what has been attempted in the past years.

The first effort to do something about Chiropractic education by getting all the school men together was attempted somewhere in 1923, when Dr. Ralph John and a group of men from state boards gathered together in Cincinnati in the hope that, by standardizing Chiropractic examinations, it would compel the schools to standardize their educational processes, and therefore we would produce better Chiropractors. We failed because, at the second meeting, there were a different group of people representing the same Boards. There was at the table a new face with different concepts from those who represented those states the previous year.

The next serious effort was made when Dr. Crider of Maryland, who succeeded Dr. Johns, called a meeting at Hollywood in 1934. I was then the secretary of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners in Connecticut, and some 19 of us attended that first meeting at

Hollywood, representing state boards of examiners and we tried to take a new tack then and rather than standardize examinations, we should ask the schools to standardize their schools and adopt a standard curriculum. As I say, we were all representatives of State Boards. We formulated some ideas and circulated them, and we met again. We met for several years. And each time we would meet we would find new faces; or we would find a new Board present and, as a result, we couldn't agree that what we had accomplished at the last meeting should be the place where we should start off on the new meeting. It was then that there popped up in the National Chiropractic Association a movement of the same character. It was led by Dr. Wilkins [sic: **Watkins**] of Montana who was the chief protagonist for it, and Dr. Gordon Goodfellow of California and, as a result of conferences between the N.C.A. and the National Council of Examining Boards, we decided to consolidate our efforts. The N.C.A. set up a committee on educational standards.

As a first effort we tried to write a school code. A code that would guide the schools. And we passed this on to the school men of the country at Grand Rapids, Michigan in 1937. Now I want to tell you gentlemen that that was an experience. For the first time in the history of Chiropractic we got practically every school owner together in one room – except one school, one school was not represented. I needn't mention what that school was, but there was one major school not represented.

At that time we announced that there ought to be a standard in the schools; that there ought first to be a standard for admission. As you probably will remember, some of you older heads, the licensing of the Chiropractor didn't even provide for a high school education, and 18 months of education was the maximum of education required by the state law. It ran all the way from 2 years of 6 months each, to 3 years of 6 months each and we said, as a general proposition, that this committee of accreditation or educational standards of the N.C.A. would propose that the schools should demand a high school education of those who came to their doors; second, that we should ask the states to change their laws to demand four years of 8 months each and at least 3,600 hours of education in Chiropractic. Thirdly, that we should ask the schools to adopt 3,600 hours of education in a four year course of 32 months, and that we should be guided by the experience of other educators in allocating to 3,600 hors in the various subjects; that anatomy should have so many hours so that the average group student – not the brilliant one, not the dull witted one, but the average student – would be able to get a comprehensive knowledge of all the basic subjects in technical sciences; that in time we would want all of the new instructors in our schools to have at least a Bachelor of Science degree in addition to their doctor's and Chiropractic; that in the future we hoped that the heads of the departments in these schools would at least have a Masters Degree. We asked that the school should have laboratories for the teaching of these practical sciences and that we should acquire plants for our schools that would meet the decencies in the location in which they were. And then we asked that all the private schools should meet with us and resolve their profit corporations into non-profit corporations and that the schools should be controlled by Boards of Trustees consisting of the profession and the public for the reason we said we wanted the public on our Boards of Trustees of our schools because we felt that it was time that the public assumed some of the responsibilities for the education of Chiropractic doctors since they had already assumed the responsibilities for the medical education not only by serving on the Boards of Trustees, by endowing medical education.

Of course, you can understand that this last request was the one that started the fireworks.

Now Dr. Adams has referred to this matter of the profit motive of the privately owned school as being of no consequence in evaluating the school. Well, of course, Dr. Adams is

quite right in saying that – provided you can find men who are operating schools for profit who are high minded enough to place the interest of the student first and may be his desire for a new Cadillac last. If we can find men who will first say, "Well, I will turn these profits over and we will buy 23 more microscopes" rather than friend wife who wants a mink coat, but they don't come that way in great numbers. And besides, we had the experience ahead of us of all the other professions in the U.S. and we were trying to be guided by a pattern of evolution which was implicit in the development of the professions. We found that medical schools, law schools and all the other professional schools in the country, through their national organizations had said, "There is an inherent evil in operating educational schools for profit, particularly professional schools, and we want to eliminate it."

Now I have in my pouch the essentials for the approval of a number of professional schools – medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, chiropractic, optometry, nursing, x-ray technicians, physiotherapy and, in all of the essentials as written by the national associations of those professions – it says that the school to be accepted must be a non–profit institution. I have them here in my pouch.

And so even in our naiveness [sic] of 1923-34 we felt that that was not a bad idea. We were also cognizant of another thing that was the historical fact in the evolution of professions in the U.S. and that was that the process of accreditation of our schools had grown from voluntary association for undergraduate colleges. Since education began in the N.E. states in pre-revolutionary times, voluntary colleges set up their standards that later on developed into a system as a frontier was pushed back. In America where the Middle Central States, and from the north to the western states formed voluntary associations and set up an accrediting standard so that eventually the credits from one college could be swapped and accepted in another college. But, of course then there developed the state system of accreditation. The state departments of Education shall accredit to the elementary or secondary schools – public schools. But we found an historical pattern there of the professions as they evolved in America, setting up the standards for their schools.

In other words – and that of course came to us from Europe naturally, all professions had its roots back in Europe, back in pre-revolutionary times – and immediately succeeding revolutionary times, so that in America today and all throughout the history of America it has been the national associations of these professions which has said what the requirements, what the education shall be for candidates who want to come in to their professions. So we have the American Bar Association, the Association of Architects, the Osteopaths, the Dentists, the Medical Association, the Optometrists – all saying "These are the requirements we shall have for those who come in to our profession." Why? "Because we have a responsibility to the public of the U.S. and we are going to guarantee to the public that those men who come in to our profession shall be soundly educated."

Then, wit this standard and this code set up, they asked the schools to meet those standards and they set up committees of inspection and then they started publishing reports on the schools, listing them as a credit or otherwise.

As a final step in the adoption of that, and guaranteeing to the public that the students who come out of these schools and come into practice would be safe, they then asked the state boards of Examiners to also adopt those standards and to also accept those schools that had met those standards.

Now this is not anything of my invention. This is what has actually happened. And, parenthetically of course, I want to state that any state Board of Chiropractic Examiners or of the Medical or of any other professional examiners has an authority granted them by the legislature and that legislature does not permit that Board to delegate its authority to any other

group. But certainly there is nothing in the law or in that process of delegating that does not permit that Board to exercise its best discretion and best wisdom in choosing for themselves a yardstick and a measure by which they will appraise the schools. So the National Chiropractic Association at that early year, and we must admit that Chiropractic has only evolved on the scene quite recently, early in its evolvement we followed the historical pattern that society had evolved in this country for the protection of the public.

Now we wrote a code, as I said, the first code came out in 1937. It was published in 1939 and this you all are acquainted with and if you want a copy of it, you can get one down in our booth in the Exhibition Hall. This was evolved over the years as the code by which we appraise schools. This the N.C.A. in this code discusses all of the things that Dr. Adams has already outlined: the question of faculty; the question of the length of time that subjects shall be taught; the entrance admission requirements; something to do with the background, the proficiency and scholastic ability, the teaching ability of the faculty and something that hasn't been mentioned so far: the equipment, the laboratory teaching, the difference between didactic and practical education in our schools. As Abraham Flexner found when he investigated medical schools, he found that wherever two or three doctors found themselves in the same town and practice wasn't good, they consolidated and made a school; they found a room with chairs and a blackboard and there was a school (of course a private profit school) and it was Abraham Flexner's great work and his great report for the Carnegie Foundation which was published in 1911 that reorganized the medical profession and has given us the great institutions of medical learning we have today. They are great from the viewpoint of medicine and I have nothing but great admiration for the work that has been done by that profession in pulling itself away from the privately owned schools. 346 privately owned schools of medicine in 1907. Of course we don't have any today.

Now we had to deal in this effort of getting rid of the private school with all its evils and of course that is something that Dr. Adams is not acquainted with. The great evils that were apparent in Chiropractic from the tug of war that occurred between private school owners' body-snatching students, offering all kinds of inducement and commissions; and we have schools opening today that are closed tomorrow or the day after. Dr. Adams very well stated that there was a need for a national association where we could have a voice or be the liaison agent between the profession and society to take care of the political, economic, social and scientific aspects of our life in the community.

In order to do this, wise and good men in Chiropractic got the two associations that then existed and we formed the National Chiropractic Association. And we said, "At last we have unity." But there was just one thing that those men were not wise enough about and that was that **they thought when they had organized unity that they would have conceptual unity**. And as you know, you must have conceptual unity first before organic unity means anything. We did get together a National Chiropractic Association and we took in all these private school men, but our Councils were rift and torn asunder by trivial fights about isms and techniques and all kinds of inane, stupid, nonsensical things that kept us fighting and divided. Therefore, it was necessary for our profession, as it was in medicine and as it has been in osteopathy and nursing, in optometry, to get rid of schools operating for profit. Of course the sad part of it is that only a few of those men made money. They eked out an existence; sometimes they had 28 students and sometimes they had 16. Sometimes they didn't eat so good. And on the other hand, sometimes they had a faculty of two or three, and sometimes they were the faculty in between taking care of patients in the front room.

That was the situation in our schools. We had 18 schools in the State of California alone – 18 in California. God knows how many we had around the rest of the country. So then we decided we would have a meeting with 51 private school owners. And we told them we would pay them off one way or the other – that we would come to an appraisal of their equities in these things and we would pay them off and the best of them could stay with us if they wanted to and devote the rest of their lives to the service of the schools.

We did that. We got 46 of these private owners to join in that agreement; 5 would not. Those 5 people are still alive; those 5 people are still running schools; those 5 people are still operating on a private basis. So you have here reached by the N.C.A. group of affiliated schools a consolidation, not an elimination, a consolidation of those schools and now we have 7 in the U.S. and 1 in Canada which is a new school, altogether. Dr. Adams referred to the New York situation, and that is a very typical situation. WE had 4 schools in New York: the old Standard School, the old Metropolitan, and the old New York School. We had Columbia. We got them together and it took me a process of 18 months in the year1940 to get these 18 men together. And over a period of 18 months we finally worked out an agreement that we would pay each of them off for whatever their equities were and we would try to have one good school in New York.

We eliminated no schools; we consolidated them and gave them a new name. We took the resources in men (there wasn't much to take in material, I assure you); I moved the laboratory out of one school in a wastebox. We put them all together and took the best men in the schools and that was the only resources those schools had; and we put them together and we now have the Chiropractic Institute of New York. We still have the Columbia College and we still have it in the same place.

Now that situation in New York is typical of the situations elsewhere. We have here a list of the approved schools of this Commission on I.C.A., dated January 1, 1955, which is the first list that has been issued.

Now there were these schools on the outside. There are already now 18 schools in your computation and every school that Dr. Adams has mentioned except one – every school except one applied to the N.C.A. for accreditation. There isn't a school on this list, except one, that hasn't applied to us for accreditation and respect. The representative of these schools here, except the last one on this list you have, sat in the Councils of the N.C.A., the Council on Education for not one year but for 3, 4 and 5 years. And they sat with dignity and with tolerance while we spent time and money in their schools trying to reorganize them. I can give you the names of the schools: The Carver Chiropractic Institute – we carried it as a provisionally approved school for I don't know, 5 or 6 years. The Cleveland Chiropractic College in Kansas. The two Cleveland men sat in our Councils. We told them what we wanted; we went down to their schools and spent weeks in their schools trying to reorganize them, trying to get them to get the proper concept about it, about the kind of faculty they should have, and trying to tell them they needed more microscopes; that they needed a decent laboratory here or there, and that is it.

Now Logan College was admitted. After three years of negotiation Logan College was admitted to the approved list. But because they refused permission to inspect their school, we had to take it off the list. There was a hearing; their lawyers were present. We heard, we gave them a right to appeal to the Council, to the House of Delegates. The Logan School refused to accept the appeal.

Now the point that I want to make here is that each of these schools, except one, accepted the authority and the principles when they asked for inspection. They all accepted a place on our list, a category which we assigned to them, and we were willing to prolong that as much as

possible to give those schools a chance to attempt to reach the proper level. When I went to the U.S. Department of Education, long before Mr. Goldthorpe was in the department, when Mr. Block and Fred N. Kelley were the head of the Department. I called Mr. Kelly and acquainted him over the years from our very earliest days as to what we were doing. I said, "Mr. Kelley, we are not in any position yet to ask for your approval yet. We are working hard. We want to keep you acquainted with what we are doing." I always had a wonderful reception. He would call in Mrs. Wilkins, he would call in Block, he called in Cassidy, he called in 9 people who used to meet with me in the Department of Education and I would simply tell them, leave them our criteria as it developed, leave them our literature, tell them about the condition of our schools. And then finally one day they said to me, "Now Dr. Nugent, you have been handing us these lists. How long are you going to keep this institute as a provisionally approved school? It is endangering the validity of your accreditation." I said, "Well, give me one more year to talk to these schools and see if something won't happen." So they gave me one more year and we finally came to the conclusion (our committee on accreditation) that we would recommend to the whole Council that the list be cleaned off and that they either be approved or non-approved.

Now when we had to take that step there was no animosity, there was no maliciousness, there was nothing but the friendliest of feeling in our Council. They came and sat with us; they dined with us and some of them wined with us. We had to tell them that we couldn't do that any more. We were endangering our whole reputation. Well, then of course they formed an organization of their own and they were joined by that school which had never applied for entrance. They called themselves the "North American Association of Schools and Colleges" and then they denied that they were going to be an accrediting agency.

When this other school got out, there was much ado about accreditation. They broadcast to the world. You have all received it at one time or another. In it they said it was a positively crazy idea, perfectly crazy this idea of accreditation. They said it was ridiculous. The solution of the situation was to have all Chiropractic colleges and their endeavors to supply the schools with competent (they used the word "competent"), trained chiropractors. Principles of chiropractic will never die. The profession can but we don't think it will. But don't bother about accrediting schools. Take them all in whether they are like them down in Wichita where the fellow gets sore with the rest of the faculty and starts a school of his own; or his father has $7,000 and he starts a school.

So you see, Dr. Adams, you are in a sense at a disadvantage trying to justify the appearance of a new accrediting or standard or accrediting association on the scene, in view of this history. You start as of January 1955. We were doing this in 1934. We talked about Dr. Goldthorpe saying there was no intention of accrediting two or three accrediting agencies in any one profession. Of course not. They say in their printed catalog they will only recognize one accrediting agency for one profession.

Now we were all set and went in with our data and our accrediting at the meeting and were all set when Dr. Goldthorpe walked in to the meeting and said, "Dr. Nugent, do you know a Dr. Keiser of Pennsylvania?" "Oh, yes," I said. "I know Dr. Keiser. He is the man who opposed and damned us for asking for four years of education in Pennsylvania." He said, "He did?" "Oh, yes," I said, "Dr. Keiser and Dr. Yokum." But he said, "They have walked in today and they said they are an accrediting agency and they want to be heard." "Well," I said, "if they are an accrediting agency, this is the first time I have heard of it." "Yes," he said, "they are an accrediting agency. They filed a whole lot of papers to claim that they were an accrediting agency." But if they had, it was as recently as when it was typewritten!

Then we had a very unfortunate situation. We had a fellow up on the west coast from California. And although California had to stand for a lot of blame for a lot of things, we can't blame California for this. He decided that he was going to be an accrediting agency. So he came in with the "Western States Agency" in spite of the fact that no schools were recognizing it. But he had a lot of papers and he dumped it.

Well, then, what happened? Everybody looked at me and said, "Well, Dr. Nugent, there is something wrong with your profession." I said, "Indeed there is." They said, "We think perhaps it is a matter of discipline. You haven't disciplined your profession yet." I said, "That is true and the reason we haven't disciplined our profession yet is that there are a lot of men with private schools and private interests in those schools who keep this thing alive. They flourish in muddy waters. They knew that there was an attempt here to approve the Chiropractic institutes of learning with the endorsement of the Federal Government and they would rather see this thing sunk even if they have to destroy this whole thing." "Well," they said, "what do you propose doing?" "Well," I said, "I propose that I will withdraw from this because I don't want to embarrass you people in this situation. I still think we have to fight this out ourselves. When we have settled it we will come and see you again."

Now that all accounts for what Dr. Goldthorpe told Dr. Adams.

Now there was no intention of these schools ever accrediting themselves until it became obvious to these schools that the State Boards of Chiropractic Examiners, using the best authority and the only standards that had evolved in Chiropractic education were using these standards to appraise these schools and accepting accreditation and so their vested interests were involved. So they said, "Well, lets have an accrediting agency, too. We will toss this in and confuse the issue." Now, had they been sincere, they would have told Dr. Adams that there was an accrediting agency; that there was a set of standards. I think I sent them to you back in 19—somewhere in 47 or 8. When I heard your name mentioned, I sent you everything that we had, to inform you that we had such a thing. And had those people been sincere, in my opinion, they would have said, "Well now, look. We have been through the mill, the Council of Education of the N.C.A., has had to let us out. Now, can we get together again and see if these standards are inordinate or improper or should be amended."

Now I haven't had much chance to investigate, to read carefully, the criteria which Dr. Adams has written up, but I am sure, as an educator, he has observed all of the principles. I think I could agree with him on every principle he has enunciated. I don't think I will find anything in his set of criteria that will be at variance with this because this is based upon the criteria set up, the general principles set up by the American Educational Association. The law has been borrowed from the osteopathic attempt, even the legal profession criteria; also from the American Medical, and it has been modified and changed to meet the situation of the Chiropractors. But the only difference is on the question of whether a non-profit school is good or could be as good as a profit school or vice versa. So that we now have a continuance and a resurgence of a divisional issue that still further keeps us apart, and frustrates us in our attempt before Congress and in our attempt before the agencies of society, before the country.

About elimination vs. consolidation: It is not a matter of elimination. The fact is that **Chiropractic education at the present time has to depend upon tuition. That is bad. And we know it**. We haven't yet educated the men in this room to the necessity of having to support their schools with an annual donation. We haven't yet done that. We are trying to. I said the men in this room and the men outside this room. The Chiropractic profession has got to be educated to the fact that they must provide the difference between what the student pays and what decent education costs. We must educate the Chiropractors to the necessity of

providing the capital funds by which we can buy chemistry laboratories, physiology labs, dissection rooms, bacteriological equipment – all of those tools, those teaching tools, which any school needs. WE take it now, if our schools have such things, we are taking it out of operating revenue and it is wrong.

And this is what we have done. Not trying to eliminate these schools, we have suggested that they consolidate. None of these schools, these small, little schools, have enough students. Schools operating with 28 students. All you have to do is multiply 28 x $350 a year and there is your total operating expense for room and equipping a school. It is ridiculous on the face of it. We said to these schools, "Why don't you consolidate and we will form a school? We will put the records, we will put the alumni associations together so that your background can be perpetuated." Now we did that in California. We put 3 schools together. The profession in California raised $212,500 to put 3 schools together. And we put those schools together and we have the Los Angeles College. We eliminated some schools in Detroit, Michigan because the man said, "We are getting too old. We don't want to get involved, so we will drop out and will cease." We talked a school out of business in Cleveland for the same reason.

So Today we have eight schools that are the end result of our negotiations with some 51 school men and these schools are modestly equipped; our faculties are finely combed; we try to get backgrounds in the faculties; we hope now the N.C.A. will at this convention will appropriate a sum for the next ten years to send out instructors, who have a Bachelor of Arts Degree, away to take graduate study. The schools have agreed to keep those men on the payroll and the N.C.A. to give them fellowships so that a man can go away and get his Masters Degree in whatever subject he elects whether it be chemistry, physiology, anatomy etc. We will the, in the course of 10 years, have a basic group in each of our accredited schools of 8 Masters of Art in their subjects. We will also have of course the special lecturers in the clinical subjects who need clinical experience and a Doctorate in Chiropractic.

So you see that if they say to you that we are attempting to eliminate, I can assure you and the men in this room NO. That it has not been a question of elimination but consolidation. You can go through all our schools and find consolidation. In Minnesota we have two schools in Minneapolis. We put those schools together and made the Northwestern College. We have gone out to California with a school put in the requirements of two years of college as a prerequisite to enter the college, and it suffered thereby in revenue. We have gone out there, have helped that school. We are in the process of helping the Western States School because the Western States School asked that a law be enacted requiring two years of education of college education for admission to a professional college. In other words, since 1934 we have had a program that went step by step by step until the final objective is that our men shall have two years of college education and 4 years of professional education, and I hope soon – graduate education.

And that is what we want. That is what we are aiming at; that is our objective.

Now we find this other movement and I know that Dr. Adams could not object to what we are trying to do. I am sure he must regret that there is such a situation existing. And I can only say that such a movement springs from either the frustration or the cupidity or the ignorance of those people who would not tell Dr. Adams the real truth about this situation and perhaps lead him onto a false position as an educator. I know that Dr. Adams doesn't want to systems of accreditation and I only know that had he known the real history of this thing; had he known the situation, I am sure that as an educator, his advice would have been to get together with the N.C.A. and see what compromise will do.

Thank you.